

### **Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-33 are now pending in this application. In the May 18, 2004 office action, claims 1-5, 9-11, 13-20, 22-24, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Helmig, Johannes "Administration via Remote Control (NetMeeting)" (hereinafter "*Helmig*"). Claims 6-8, 12, 21, 25, and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Helmig* in view of NetMeeting Web Pages (hereinafter "*NWP*").

For the reasons set forth below, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application. Prior to discussing the reasons why the applicants believe that the claims current pending in this application are allowable, a brief description of the present invention and the cited references is presented.

### **Summary of the Invention**

The present invention provides a system and method for providing computer user access to computing services, including operating systems, software applications, data storage and retrieval, electronic mail and messaging services, and data and software security in an on-line networked computing environment. These computing services are provided to a user from a remote computing device, which may include a number of components including a terminal server, a file server, a web server, and a domain controller. By providing these services to one or more users from a remote computing device, all software and hardware installations and upgrades can be performed at the remote computing device, rather than at each user location.

Additionally, the present invention allows a user to obtain these services from any computer that has an Internet browser to connect to the remote computing device. The user is able to store a desktop configuration in the file server so that he is presented with the exact configuration that he desires regardless of what computer is used to connect to the computer service provider. Essentially, a user is able to log in from any computer, regardless of the software loaded on that computer, and as long as the computer has an Internet browser, he will be provided with his personal desktop configuration and may utilize any variety of applications and data stored on the remote computing device.

For example, user A utilizes any computer with an Internet browser to log into the computer service provider. User A is then presented with User A's desktop configuration and has access to all of his programs and files. User A sees his exact same desktop configuration and has access to the exact same programs and files regardless of whether he uses a computer at work, at home, in a hotel, or at a friend's house.

#### Summary of the Prior Art

The cited art describes aspects of Microsoft NetMeeting. NetMeeting is used as a tool for conferencing between multiple users. Users with NetMeeting may speak to each other and share videos etc. NetMeeting has a remote desktop sharing feature. This feature allows a user at a first location to turn on the remote desktop sharing feature of NetMeeting at their computer. A second user at a second location may then call the computer at the first location and view the first user's desktop and control certain aspects of the first user's computer. For example, user A sees user B's desktop configuration on user A's computer screen and is able to interact and perform certain functions on user B's computer through user B's desktop seen on user A's computer screen.

#### Independent Claim 1

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 1. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, "providing a computing device a software module from a remote computing device for allowing exchange of data between the computing device and the remote computing device" as recited by claim 1. The portion of *Helmig* cited by the May 18, 2004 Office Action shows that one computer may place a call to another in order to see the desktop of the other. *Helmig* does not teach a remote computer that provides a computing device with a software module for allowing data exchange. The software taught by *Helmig* that allows data exchange is installed by NetMeeting, which is not provided by the remote computer.

Additionally, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe “providing the computing device, through the software module, an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration, the desktop configuration being passed to the computing device from the remote computing device” as recited by claim 1. The desktop configuration shown in *Helmig* is that of the remote computing device’s desktop, not the computing device’s desktop configuration, as is recited by claim 1. According to one aspect of the present invention, a user’s desktop configuration is stored at the remote computing device so that when the user logs on from any computer, the user’s own desktop configuration is retrieved and provided to the user. This desktop configuration is separate and distinct from the desktop of the remote computing device. The desktop configuration of the remote computing device may be different from that of the user and is not provided to the user. This contrasts the teachings of *Helmig*, wherein the remote computing device’s desktop is provided to the computing device instead of the computing device’s desktop being provided to the computing device. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over *Helmig*.

Dependent Claims 11, 19, and 29

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 19, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claims 11, 19, and 29. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “providing a plurality of software applications subscribed to for use by the computing device” as recited by claims 11, 19, and 29. The May 18, 2004 Office Action suggests that the files shared between computers in the system taught by *Helmig* could be subscribed to. However, *Helmig* teaches allowing control and interaction with the applications of a remote computer through the emulation of the remote computer’s desktop on a computing device. The applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing in any of the cited art that suggests that any of the remote computer’s applications are restricted from use by the computing device unless the computing device has subscribed to the application. For at least this reason, and because claims 11, 19, and 29 depend from allowable independent base claims 1, 18, and 28, dependent claims 11, 19, and 29 are allowable over *Helmig*.

Dependent Claims 13, 23, and 27

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 23, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claims 13, 23, and 27. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “storing authentication information and the desktop configuration on the remote computing device” as recited by claims 13, 23, and 27. As discussed above, the remote computing device taught by *Helmig* does not store the computing device’s desktop configuration. Rather, *Helmig* teaches displaying the desktop configuration of the remote computing device at the computing device. Therefore, it is the remote computing device’s desktop configuration that is stored at the remote computing device, not the computing device’s desktop configuration. For at least this reason, and because claims 13, 23, and 27 depend from allowable independent base claims 1, 20, and 24, dependent claims 13, 23, and 27 are allowable over *Helmig*.

Dependent Claim 14

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 14. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “storing authentication information and the desktop configuration on the file server” as recited by claim 14. *Helmig* does not teach a file server. Additionally, as discussed above, the remote computing device taught by *Helmig* does not store the computing device’s desktop configuration. For at least these reasons, and because claim 14 depends from allowable independent base claim 1, dependent claim 14 is allowable over *Helmig*.

Dependent Claims 17 and 31

The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claims 17 and 31. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “wherein the remote computing device includes a plurality of computing

devices” and “determining whether the computing device has previously been connected to one of the plurality of remote computing devices” as recited by claims 17 and 31. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach a plurality of remote computer devices. Additionally, *Helmig* does not teach determining if the computing device was previously connected to one of the plurality of remote computing devices, or even a single remote computing device. For at least these reasons, and because claims 17 and 31 depends from allowable independent claims 1 and 28, dependent claims 17 and 31 are allowable over *Helmig*.

#### Independent Claim 18

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 18. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “providing the computing device a software module from the terminal server for allowing exchange of data between the computing device and the remote terminal server” and “providing the computing device, through the software module, an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration, the desktop configuration being passed to the computing device from the remote terminal server” as recited by claim 18.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Helmig* does not teach a terminal server that provides a software module to the computing device for allowing data exchange or a remote terminal server that passes an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration to the computing device. For at least these reasons, independent claim 18 is allowable over *Helmig*.

#### Independent Claim 20

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 20. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “providing a computing device a software module from a remote computing device for allowing exchange of data between the computing device and the remote computing device” and

“providing the computing device, through the software module, an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration, the desktop configuration being passed to the computing device from the remote computing device” as recited by claim 20.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Helmig* does not teach a terminal server that provides a software module to the computing device for allowing data exchange or a remote terminal server that passes an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration to the computing device. For at least these reasons, independent claim 20 is allowable over *Helmig*.

#### Independent Claim 24

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 24. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “providing a computing device a software module from a remote computing device for allowing exchange of data between the computing device and the remote computing device” and “providing the computing device, through the software module, an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration, the desktop configuration being passed to the computing device from the remote computing device” as recited by claim 24.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Helmig* does not teach a terminal server that provides a software module to the computing device for allowing data exchange or a remote terminal server that passes an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration to the computing device. For at least these reasons, independent claim 24 is allowable over *Helmig*.

#### Independent Claim 28

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Helmig*. The applicants respectfully submit that *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 28. Specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe a system comprising a domain controller, a remote terminal server, and a file server as recited by

claim 28. *Helmig* teaches sharing the desktop of one computer with another computer user. Because *Helmig* does not teach a domain controller, a remote terminal server, and a file server, *Helmig* could not teach the specific operations of each as they interact as a system, as is recited by claim 28.

More specifically, *Helmig* does not teach, suggest, or describe a remote terminal server operative “to provide the computing device a software module for allowing exchange of data between the computing device and the remote terminal server” and “to provide the computing device, through the software module, an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration, the desktop configuration being passed to the computing device from the remote terminal server” as recited by claim 28.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, *Helmig* does not teach a terminal server that provides a software module to the computing device for allowing data exchange or a remote terminal server that passes an emulation of the computing device’s desktop configuration to the computing device. For at least these reasons, independent claim 28 is allowable over *Helmig*.

Dependent Claims 2-10, 12, 15-16, 21-22, 25-26, 30, and 32-33

Because the cited art fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 2-10, 12, 15-16, 21-22, 25-26, 30, and 32-33 and because claims 2-10, 12, 15-16, 21-22, 25-26, 30, and 32-33 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 20, 24, and 28, dependent claims 2-10, 12, 15-16, 21-22, 25-26, 30, and 32-33 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Amendment And Response  
Serial No. 09/804,979

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC



Date: August 16, 2004

By: Leonard J. Hope  
Reg. No. 44,774

Merchant & Gould  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

